



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,748	03/17/2004	Dana M. Walker	20240	6866
66061 7590 06/17/2010 MEADWESTVACO CORPORATION ATTN: IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT 1021 MAIN CAMPUS DRIVE RALEIGH, NC 27606				
EXAMINER				
KATCOFF, MATTHEW GORDON				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3725				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/17/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketadministrator@mwv.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,748

Applicant(s)

WALKER ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew G. Katcoff

Art Unit

3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 11-17, 19-26, 28-31, 34-36, 38, 39 and 41-45 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 11-17, 19-26, 28-31, 34-36, 38, 39 and 41-45 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-944)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 03 May 2010 has been entered and is sufficient to overcome the 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 1, 9, 19 and 29 but is insufficient to overcome the prior art rejections of claims 1-6, 9-17, 19-26, 28-32, 34-36, 38, 39, 41 and 43-45. The rejection of claims 1-6, 9-17, 19-26, 28-32, 34-36, 38, 39, 41 and 43-45 are maintained and recited below and a new 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 1, 19 and 29 is added below based on the 112 rejection of claim 9. Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 1-6, 11-17, 19-26, 28-32, 34-36, 38, 39, 41 and 43-45 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 19 and 29 recites the limitation "said slit is pivotable about said **crease**" emphasis added. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim as no crease has been positively recited in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6, 11-17, 19-26, 28-31, 35-36, 39 and 43-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,614,450 to Neiman (*Neiman*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,080,223 to Mitsuyama (*Mitsuyama*), U.S. Patent No. 4,345,394 to Sullivan (*Sullivan*) and U.S. Patent No. 2,333,798 to Kner (*Kner*).

Concerning claims 1 and 2, *Neiman* discloses a system comprising at least one storage sheet (10) having at least two pockets (pockets 18 used for storing index cards) in a notebook (figure 1) having a front and back cover and a binding mechanism (16). *Neiman* further discloses that the pockets are transparent (abstract). *Neiman* does not however disclose the storage sheet having a backing sheet, a panel pocket between the at least one card pocket and the backing sheet and including at least one supply sheet having a plurality of index cards formed therein and detachable therefrom.

Mitsuyama teaches having a storage sheet having a backing sheet (32) and a panel pocket (37) between at least one pocket (43) and the backing sheet (figure 8-9) as well as a mouth and a flap for selectively covering the mouth (figure 8, flap 35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the panel pocket and backing as taught by *Mitsuyama* with the storage sheet of *Neiman* for the purpose of providing additional storage.

Sullivan teaches having a supply sheet (figure 3) capable of being bound in a notebook via binding edge (36) and having at least one detachable index card thereon with perforations (figure 3), the cards of *Sullivan* satisfy the requirement of being "index cards" in that they can be filed, as in the pockets in figure 2 for example and they can receive text).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the supply sheet of *Sullivan* with the system of *Neiman* modified by *Mitsuyama* for the purpose of allowing the user to store both the index cards and the supply sheet together, especially since *Sullivan* teaches assembling both a supply sheet and pocket sheet in a binder (column 1 lines 40-43 of *Sullivan*).

Regarding the sizing of the card pockets and index cards, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to size the pockets and index cards as claimed since such a modification would have involved a mere change in size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). It is noted that applicant provides no criticality to the size of the pockets or cards (specification page 4 paragraph 0021).

Finally, neither *Neiman* nor *Mitsuyama* nor *Sullivan* teaches the card pocket having a slit for receiving said flap.

Kner teaches a flap (6) and a front panel (2) which includes a cutout (24) and along the lower edge of said cutout being a slit (23) for receiving part of the

flap (7) to retain the flap in a closed position wherein said flap generally covers said mouth (figure 1) wherein said slit extends laterally beyond said cutout (figure 2). And wherein the slit edge is pivotable about a crease (page 2, column 2, lines 13-22) and the slit edge forms an angle with the body (see figure 1) and is shaped to guide said flap thereunder when said flap is moved to said closed position (page 2, column 2, lines 13-22).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the flap and mouth disclosed by *Mitsuyama* with the flap and mouth disclosed by *Kner* because this is simply the substitution of one known technique for closing a flap for another with predictable results.

Concerning claim 3 wherein the system further comprises a plurality of sheets of paper bound by the binding mechanism. It is well known to provide sheets of paper in a notebook. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include sheets of paper in the notebook of *Neiman* (modified by *Mitsuyama*, *Sullivan* and *Kner*) for the purpose of providing the user with sheets for writing information thereon.

Regarding the limitations of claim 4 wherein the supply sheet is similar in shape but generally smaller than the sheets of paper and the limitations of claims 12, 14-16 wherein the index cards are of a specific size, it is well known to have paper or index cards of various sizes therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to alter the

size of the sheet as suited for the intended use, especially since applicant has provided no criticality towards the size of the paper (page 6 paragraph [0026] of spec.) nor the size of the index cards (page 4 paragraph [0021] last 5 lines of spec.).

Regarding claim 5, *Neiman* discloses in figure 1 a front cover and a back cover (17) and the covers are bound to the sheets by a binding mechanism (14, 15 and 16)

Regarding the limitations of claim 6 wherein the binding mechanism is a helical coil or twin wire, *Neiman* uses binding rings as the binding mechanism but helical coil and twin wire binders are also a well known binding mechanism. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a well known helical coil binder for the purpose of binding the sheets together, since binding rings and helical coil binders are art recognized equivalents.

Concerning claim 9, *Kner* discloses the slit edge is pivotable about a crease (page 2, column 2, lines 13-22).

Concerning claim 10, *Kner* discloses the slit edge forms an angle with a body of said pocket and is shaped to guide said flap there under (figure 1).

Regarding claim 11, *Neiman* (modified by *Mitsuyama, Sullivan* and *Kner*) discloses having two pockets being rectangular in shape and the first pocket having a longitudinal axis. *Neiman* (modified by *Mitsuyama, Sullivan* and *Kner*) does not however disclose that the second rectangular pocket has a longitudinal

axis perpendicular to the axis of the first pocket. However changing the size of the pocket such that the longitudinal axis of the second pocket is perpendicular to the axis of the first pocket would be an obvious matter of design choice. This modification would allow for storing index cards of different sizes.

Regarding claim 13, *Neiman* (modified by *Mitsuyama, Sullivan and Kner*) discloses the index card being formed on the supply sheet by a plurality of perforations in the supply sheet (figure 3 of *Sullivan*).

Regarding claim 17, *Neiman* (modified by *Mitsuyama, Sullivan and Kner*) discloses the pocket being made of a generally entirely transparent material (abstract and figure 3 of *Neiman*). *Neiman* (modified by *Mitsuyama, Sullivan and Kner*) also satisfies the method for assembling an index card storage system, recited in claims 19-26.

Concerning claims 19 and 20, the method disclosed is inherent in the system of claim 1 and 2 and is thus rejected on at least the same grounds as claims 1 and 2 are rejected above.

Concerning claim 21, the method disclosed is inherent in the system of claim 3 and is thus rejected on at least the same grounds as claim 3 is rejected above.

Concerning claim 22, the method disclosed is inherent in the system of claim 3 and is thus rejected on at least the same grounds as claim 3 is rejected above.

Concerning claim 23, the method disclosed is inherent in the system of claim 12 and is thus rejected on at least the same grounds as claim 12 is rejected above.

Concerning claim 24, the method disclosed is inherent in the system of claim 15 and is thus rejected on at least the same grounds as claim 15 is rejected above.

Concerning claim 25, the method disclosed is inherent in the system of claim 13 and is thus rejected on at least the same grounds as claim 13 is rejected above.

Concerning claim 26, the method disclosed is inherent in the system of claim 17 and is thus rejected on at least the same grounds as claim 17 is rejected above.

Regarding the method steps of claim 28, *Neiman* teaches providing a storage sheet with a pocket thereon and a binding mechanism and a teaching of placing index cards in the pockets (*Neiman* figure 3). *Mitsuyama* teaches providing a storage sheet having a backing sheet (32) and a panel pocket (37) between at least one pocket (43) and the backing sheet (figures 8-9 of *Mitsuyama*). *Sullivan* teaches having a supply sheet with detachable index cards thereon and placing the detached card in a pocket (*Sullivan* figure 2). Therefore it would have been obvious to place the index card of *Sullivan* in the pocket of *Neiman* modified by *Mitsuyama* for the purpose of providing safe storage of the card.

Regarding claim 29, the method discloses is disclosed by claims 19 and 28 and thus claim 29 is rejected on at least the same grounds as claims 19 and 28 are rejected above.

Regarding claim 30, see rejection of claim 18 above.

Regarding claim 31, see rejection of claim 17 above.

Regarding claim 35, see rejection of claim 13 above.

Regarding claim 36, see rejection of claim 17 above.

Regarding claim 39, see rejection of claim 17 above.

Regarding claims 43-45, *Neiman* modified by *Mitsuyama* and *Sullivan* disclose each of the index cards has a front and back surface (figure 3 of *Sullivan*- only front shown), wherein when the index card is placed in the card pocket at least the front is entirely visible (both *Neiman* and *Mitsuyama* disclose transparent pockets (abstract of *Sullivan*, column 2 lines 37-41 of *Mitsuyama*).

6. Claims 34, 38 and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Neiman* in view of *Mitsuyama*, *Sullivan* and *Kner* as applied above and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,178 to Walton (*Walton*).

Concerning claim 34, the combination of *Neiman* in view of *Mitsuyama*, *Sullivan* and *Kner* does not disclose said plurality of card pockets are spaced apart in a generally co-planar, non-overlapping configuration.

Walton discloses wherein said plurality of card pockets (20) are spaced apart and arranged in a generally co-planar, non-overlapping configuration (figures 1, 2 and 5D).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the card pockets of *Neiman* to be in a generally co-planar, non-overlapping configuration because, as disclosed by *Walton* this is another way of arranging card pockets and is thus an obvious variation. This combination would be a simple substitution of one known way of arranging card pockets for another with predictable results.

Regarding claim 38, see rejection of claim 34 above.

Regarding claim 41, see rejection of claim 34 above.

7. Claims 1-2, 19, 29, 34, 38 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walton* in view of *Mitsuyama*, *Sullivan* and *Kner*.

Concerning claims 1 and 2, *Walton* discloses a storage system having at least one storage sheet (figure 1) with at least two pockets that is to be bound in a notebook binder (abstract). *Walton* further discloses that the pocket includes a mouth and flap (figures 7a-d) and having a plurality of pockets spaced apart and arranged in a generally co-planar, non-overlapping relation (figure 7d). *Walton* however fails to disclose the backing sheet and panel pocket and a supply sheet having an index card formed therein and detachable therefrom and a binding mechanism for binding the sheet together with the storage sheet.

Mitsuyama teaches having a storage sheet having a backing sheet (32) and a panel pocket (37) between at least one pocket (43) and the backing sheet (figures 8-9) as well as a mouth and a flap for selectively covering the mouth (figure 8, flap 35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the panel pocket and backing as taught by *Mitsuyama* with the storage sheet of *Walton* for the purpose of providing additional storage. *Sullivan* teaches having at least one supply sheet having a plurality of index cards formed therein and detachable therefrom (figure 3 of *Sullivan*) and that has a binding edge (28) to be bound in a notebook (column 1 lines 40-43 of *Sullivan*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the storage sheet and binding mechanism (notebook) as taught by *Walton* with the supply sheet and binding edge of *Sullivan* modified by *Mitsuyama* for the purpose of providing storage for both the supply and storage sheets. Regarding the sizing of the card pockets and index cards, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to size the pockets and index cards as claimed since such a modification would have involved a mere change in size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In *re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). It is noted that applicant provides no criticality to the size of the pockets or cards (specification page 4 paragraph 0021).

Finally, neither *Walton* nor *Mitsuyama* nor *Sullivan* teaches the card pocket having a slit for receiving said flap.

Kner teaches a flap (6) and a front panel (2) which includes a cutout (24) and along the lower edge of said cutout being a slit (23) for receiving part of the

flap (7) to retain the flap in a closed position wherein said flap generally covers said mouth (figure 1) wherein said slit extends laterally beyond said cutout (figure 2). And wherein the slit edge is pivotable about a crease (page 2, column 2, lines 13-22) and the slit edge forms an angle with the body (see figure 1) and is shaped to guide said flap thereunder when said flap is moved to said closed position (page 2, column 2, lines 13-22).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the flap and mouth disclosed by *Mitsuyama* with the flap and mouth disclosed by *Kner* because this is simply the substitution of one known technique for closing a flap for another with predictable results.

Concerning claims 19 and 29, *Walton* modified by *Mitsuyama* and *Sullivan* further discloses the method of assembling an index card storage system. Regarding the sizing of the card pockets and index cards, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to size the pockets and index cards as claimed since such a modification would have involved a mere change in size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). It is noted that applicant provides no criticality to the size of the pockets or cards (specification page 4 paragraph 0021).

Concerning claim 34, *Walton* discloses wherein said plurality of card pockets (20) are spaced apart and arranged in a generally co-planar, non-overlapping configuration (figures 1, 2 and 5D).

Regarding claim 38, see rejection of claim 34 above.

Regarding claim 41, see rejection of claim 34 above.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 03 May 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a. Regarding the argument for the 112 rejection of claims 1, 19 and 29, the new matter recited in the claims pertains to the crease limitation and thus the amendment of the word "cutout" to read "cut-out" does not overcome the rejection.
- b. Regarding the argument that *Kner* does not disclose a slit edge pivotable about a crease, *Kner* discloses a crease (24) and a slit edge (23) and is disclosed a pivotable (page 2, column 2, lines 13-22).
- c. Regarding the argument that *Kner*'s slit edge is formed within the plane of the front panel and not forming an angle with the body of the pocket, the slit edge forms an angle as disclosed in figure 1.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew G. Katcoff whose telephone number is (571) 270-1415. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross can be reached on (571) 272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dana Ross/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3725

/M. G. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 3725
06/08/2010